

# The Post-Interventionist Paradox: Intelligence, Accountability, and the 2026 Iranian Conflict

Douglas C. Youvan

[doug@youvan.com](mailto:doug@youvan.com)

[www.youvan.ai](http://www.youvan.ai)

March 12, 2026

The rapid escalation of military hostilities between the United States and Iran in early 2026 has fundamentally challenged the geopolitical and domestic political alignments of the previous decade. What began as a series of surgical strikes under "Operation Epic Fury" has evolved into a regional confrontation with profound implications for global energy security and international law. Central to this shift is the internal friction within the American executive branch, where the "America First" doctrine of non-interventionism has collided with the tactical demands of a high-stakes military campaign. This paper examines the role of key cabinet figures—specifically Secretary of War Pete Hegseth and Director of National Intelligence Tulsi Gabbard—as they navigate the transition from anti-war rhetoric to the administration of a major conflict. By analyzing leaked intelligence assessments, the disruption of the Strait of Hormuz, and the political strategy of burden-shifting within the White House, this study explores the "Post-Interventionist Paradox." It argues that the current conflict represents a unique case study in how populist administrations manage the fallout of "forever wars" they once campaigned against, potentially reshaping the future of American foreign policy and the structural integrity of the U.S. intelligence community for the next decade.

Keywords: Geopolitics, Iran Conflict 2026, Operation Epic Fury, Tulsi Gabbard, Pete Hegseth, National Intelligence Council, Strait of Hormuz, Post-Interventionism, U.S. Foreign Policy, Intelligence Accountability.

A collaboration with Google Gemini-3.1-Thinking. CC4.0.

## **Outline**

1. Introduction: The Geopolitical Landscape of March 2026
2. Operation Epic Fury: Origins and Tactical Objectives
3. The Post-Interventionist Dilemma: Campaign Rhetoric vs. Military Reality
4. The Strait of Hormuz and the Global Energy Crisis
5. Leadership Transition in Tehran: The Rise of Mojtaba Khamenei
6. Internal Friction: The Secretary of War vs. The Director of National Intelligence
7. The NIC Leak: Intelligence Assessments and the Myth of Regime Change
8. The Politics of Blame: Presidential Strategy and Cabinet Accountability
9. Humanitarian Consequences and Regional Spillover: Lebanon and the UAE
10. The Whistleblower Prospect: Speculation on Tulsi Gabbard's Resignation
11. Future Implications: American Populism and Global Stability
12. Conclusion and References

Art

## **1: Introduction: The Geopolitical Landscape of March 2026?**

The month of March 2026 marks a watershed moment in twenty-first-century geopolitics, characterized by the collapse of long-standing diplomatic frameworks and the emergence of a direct, high-intensity conflict between a U.S.-led coalition and the Islamic Republic of Iran. By March 10, the regional landscape has been fundamentally altered by the military campaign known as Operation Epic Fury, which commenced in late February following a series of escalations involving maritime security and nuclear enrichment milestones. Unlike the proxy-driven conflicts of the previous decade, the current situation is defined by direct kinetic engagements, the targeting of sovereign command-and-control infrastructure, and a significant shift in Iranian leadership following the death of Ayatollah Ali Khamenei. The geopolitical vacuum created by this transition has been rapidly filled by his son, Mojtaba Khamenei, whose ascension has signaled a more confrontational and less predictable stance from Tehran. Simultaneously, the global economy is grappling with the physical disruption of the Strait of Hormuz, through which a critical portion of the world's petroleum passes. With oil prices surging past the 100 dollar per barrel threshold, the domestic political pressure within the United States has reached a boiling point, forcing the administration to balance its populist, non-interventionist campaign promises against the tactical realities of an expanding Middle Eastern theater. This introductory section establishes the volatile atmosphere of early 2026, where traditional alliances are being tested and the specter of a broader regional war looms over the international community.

## **2. Operation Epic Fury: Origins and Tactical Objectives**

The military campaign designated as Operation Epic Fury represents the most significant shift in American foreign policy toward the Middle East since the 2003 invasion of Iraq. The origins of this kinetic engagement can be traced back to January 2026, when the United States intelligence community reported a dramatic acceleration in Iran's uranium enrichment levels at the Fordow and Natanz facilities. While previous administrations had relied on economic sanctions and diplomatic stagnation, the current executive branch opted for a preemptive doctrine designed to permanently dismantle the nuclear threat. The immediate catalyst for the February 28 strikes was a series of classified briefings presented to the president, suggesting that Iranian-backed proxies were preparing a coordinated swarm drone attack against American naval assets in the Persian Gulf. This intelligence provided the legal and political justification for the initiation of large-scale aerial bombardments.

The primary tactical objectives of Operation Epic Fury were divided into three distinct phases. The first phase focused on the total suppression of Iranian integrated air defense systems,

utilizing stealth technology and long-range standoff munitions to create corridors of aerial superiority. Once the skies were contested, the second phase targeted the physical infrastructure of the Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps, specifically focusing on missile manufacturing plants and drone storage depots located in the mountainous regions of central Iran. The intent was to degrade the regime's ability to project power across the region and protect its proxies in Lebanon and Yemen. The third and most controversial phase involved deep-penetration strikes against hardened nuclear sites. These operations utilized specialized bunker-buster munitions to collapse subterranean laboratories, a move that international observers warned would lead to irreversible environmental and political consequences.

Beyond the destruction of physical assets, Operation Epic Fury was designed with the strategic goal of decapitation. By targeting command-and-control hubs in Tehran, the coalition sought to disrupt the continuity of government and force a rapid collapse of the clerical establishment. The precision of these strikes, while heralded by the Department of War as a triumph of modern engineering, has been met with skepticism regarding long-term regional stability. Unlike the counter-insurgency operations of the past two decades, this campaign was marketed to the American public as a surgical, high-tech intervention that would avoid the pitfalls of nation-building. However, as the conflict enters its second week of sustained violence, the transition from tactical success to strategic victory remains elusive, raising questions about the finality of the objectives initially set forth by the administration.

### **3. The Post-Interventionist Dilemma: Campaign Rhetoric vs. Military Reality**

The initiation of Operation Epic Fury has created a profound ideological schism within the current administration, surfacing a tension between the populist "America First" platform and the traditional imperatives of Middle Eastern military engagement. During the 2024 campaign and throughout the first year of the term, the executive branch repeatedly signaled a desire to pivot away from what were termed "stupid, endless wars" in the region. This rhetoric was centered on the belief that American blood and treasure had been squandered on nation-building projects that lacked clear exit strategies. However, the 2026 escalation with Iran has forced a recalculation of this non-interventionist stance. The dilemma lies in the administration's attempt to frame a massive aerial and naval campaign as a departure from previous neoconservative policies, rather than a continuation of them.

The rhetorical strategy employed to bridge this gap involves the concept of "Total Victory Through Superiority" rather than "Permanent Presence." By emphasizing the use of high-tech standoff munitions and avoiding a large-scale deployment of ground troops, the administration argues that it is avoiding the quagmires of the past. Yet, the military reality of March 2026

suggests that surgical strikes often necessitate a broader commitment to manage the resulting chaos. As the conflict spills into Lebanon and disrupts the global energy supply, the "quick and decisive" narrative is being tested by the resilience of the Iranian state and its regional proxies. This has led to a bifurcated political environment where the President must simultaneously project strength to a domestic audience and reassure a base that remains deeply skeptical of any new Middle Eastern entanglements.

Furthermore, the administration's reliance on figures like Tulsi Gabbard, who built a political identity on anti-war principles, underscores the depth of this paradox. The presence of such individuals in the cabinet was intended to serve as a firewall against "forever wars," yet they now find themselves overseeing one of the most significant escalations in modern history. This internal conflict is not merely academic; it has practical implications for how intelligence is processed and how military objectives are communicated. As the disconnect between campaign promises of peace and the reality of ongoing strikes widens, the administration faces the risk of alienating its core constituency. The resulting political friction suggests that the "Post-Interventionist" era may be less about the absence of war and more about the rebranding of military power under a new set of populist justifications.

#### **4. The Strait of Hormuz and the Global Energy Crisis**

The tactical escalation of Operation Epic Fury reached a critical inflection point when the Iranian maritime forces, operating under the command of the new Supreme Leadership, executed a series of asymmetric maneuvers designed to obstruct the Strait of Hormuz. As a chokepoint through which approximately one-fifth of the world's total oil consumption passes, the closure or even the credible threat of disruption to this waterway has historically functioned as Iran's primary economic deterrent. By March 2026, the reality of this disruption transitioned from theoretical signaling to physical blockage. Reports of sea mines and the deployment of semi-autonomous fast-attack craft led to a de facto cessation of commercial shipping, as major insurance underwriters revoked coverage for tankers attempting to transit the Persian Gulf.

The immediate consequence of this maritime standstill was a violent shock to the global energy markets. For the first time in years, Brent crude oil prices surged past the 100 dollar per barrel threshold, with some analysts projecting a spike toward 150 dollars if the blockade remains unresolved. This energy crisis has not remained localized to the Middle East; its effects have radiated through the global supply chain, increasing the cost of manufacturing and transportation in Europe, Asia, and North America. In the United States, the administration faces a significant domestic challenge as retail gasoline prices climb, threatening to undermine the economic stability that was a cornerstone of the executive's populist mandate. The irony of

an "America First" energy policy being derailed by a foreign military intervention has not been lost on political observers.

Furthermore, the disruption has forced a realignment of regional energy logistics. The recent drone strikes on the Ruwais Industrial City in the United Arab Emirates exacerbated the crisis, signaling that even land-based infrastructure and bypass pipelines are vulnerable to the reach of Iranian-aligned militias. The global energy crisis of 2026 is therefore characterized by a dual threat: the physical inability to move product through the Strait and the degradation of production facilities through aerial warfare. As the United States considers a tactical takeover of the waterway to restore order, the risk of a permanent, high-intensity naval presence looms, further complicating the administration's stated desire to reduce overseas commitments.

## **5. Leadership Transition in Tehran: The Rise of Mojtaba Khamenei**

The geopolitical calculations of the 2026 conflict were fundamentally altered by the sudden vacancy at the apex of the Iranian power structure. The death of Supreme Leader Ayatollah Ali Khamenei, occurring amidst the opening salvos of Operation Epic Fury, triggered a rapid and legally opaque succession process that bypassed several traditional clerical hurdles. In a move that surprised many Western analysts but had been long rumored in intelligence circles, his second son, Mojtaba Khamenei, was officially elevated to the position of Supreme Leader. This transition represents a shift from the cautious, pragmatic balancing act of the elder Khamenei to a more aggressive, militaristic posture defined by Mojtaba's deep historical ties to the Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps.

The rise of Mojtaba Khamenei has effectively unified the clerical and military wings of the Iranian state under a single, confrontational vision. Unlike his father, who often utilized a "strategic patience" doctrine to outlast Western administrations, the younger Khamenei has signaled an immediate commitment to total resistance. His first official decree as Supreme Leader was the declaration of a "Defensive Jihad," which authorized the use of all available asymmetric and conventional assets to target coalition interests throughout the region. This consolidation of power has silenced internal moderate factions that might have otherwise advocated for a diplomatic off-ramp, as the new leadership views the current conflict not as a crisis to be managed, but as an existential struggle that justifies extreme measures.

For the United States and its allies, this leadership transition has rendered previous diplomatic playbooks obsolete. The administration's hope that decapitation strikes or the death of the elder Khamenei would lead to a popular uprising or a more compliant interim government has, thus far, proven incorrect. Instead, Mojtaba's ascension has catalyzed a rally-around-the-flag effect within the Iranian security apparatus. The new leader's willingness to risk the total

disruption of the Strait of Hormuz suggests a high tolerance for economic pain in exchange for tactical leverage. As March 2026 progresses, the international community is forced to contend with a Tehran that is more ideologically rigid and tactically bold than at any point in the last four decades.

## **6. Internal Friction: The Secretary of War vs. The Director of National Intelligence**

The bureaucratic landscape of the executive branch in March 2026 is defined by an escalating rivalry between Secretary of War Pete Hegseth and Director of National Intelligence Tulsi Gabbard. This friction is not merely personal but representative of a deeper ideological divide regarding the scope and purpose of American military power. Hegseth, acting as the primary advocate for the expansion of Operation Epic Fury, has consistently pushed for a maximalist approach to the Iranian threat. His rhetoric, characterized by a belief in the total restoration of American deterrence through overwhelming force, has often clashed with the more cautious and skepticism-laden intelligence reports emanating from the office of the Director of National Intelligence.

Gabbard's position as Director of National Intelligence was initially framed as a check on the perceived overreach of the intelligence community and a safeguard against foreign entanglements. However, as the conflict has intensified, her office has become a source of internal dissent. While Hegseth utilizes televised briefings to champion the success of the bombing campaign and the impending collapse of the Iranian regime, Gabbard has overseen the production of intelligence assessments that paint a far more complex and dire picture. This divergence reached a breaking point in early March when the Secretary of War publicly dismissed warnings regarding regional spillover as defeatist, while the Director of National Intelligence's subordinates continued to leak data suggesting that the tactical gains in Iran were being offset by strategic losses in global diplomatic standing.

The tension between these two figures has created a fractured decision-making environment for the President. On one side, the Department of War provides the "can-do" military solutions that align with the administration's desire for decisive action; on the other, the intelligence community provides a sobering analysis of the long-term consequences of such actions. This internal conflict has led to a series of contradictory public statements from the White House, as the administration attempts to project a unified front while its top advisors remain fundamentally at odds over whether the war should be expanded into a broader regional campaign or transitioned into a negotiated withdrawal.

## **7. The NIC Leak: Intelligence Assessments and the Myth of Regime Change**

The internal cohesion of the administration's foreign policy faced its most significant challenge on March 9, 2026, when a highly classified assessment from the National Intelligence Council was leaked to the press. This document, produced under the oversight of the Office of the Director of National Intelligence, provided a sobering contradiction to the triumphalist narrative of the Department of War. The assessment concluded that despite the heavy degradation of Iranian military infrastructure and the high-profile elimination of key leadership figures, the structural integrity of the Islamic Republic remained resilient. Most damaging to the administration's public position was the report's finding that the strikes had actually consolidated domestic support for the new Supreme Leader, Mojtaba Khamenei, rather than triggering the popular uprising that proponents of the war had predicted.

The leak exposed a fundamental disagreement within the intelligence community regarding the efficacy of kinetic regime change. While political appointees in the Pentagon argued that the Iranian state was a house of cards ready to fall under sufficient pressure, the career analysts at the National Intelligence Council argued that forty-seven years of institutionalized revolutionary ideology could not be dismantled through aerial bombardment alone. The report suggested that the "myth of regime change"—the idea that a foreign power can surgically remove a government and install a stable, pro-Western successor—was once again leading American policy into a strategic cul-de-sac. This revelation suggested that the endgame for Operation Epic Fury was not a democratic transition, but a power vacuum that was rapidly being filled by the most radical elements of the Iranian security apparatus.

The fallout from this disclosure has been catastrophic for the administration's messaging. By revealing that the President's own intelligence agencies doubted the long-term success of his primary military initiative, the leak handed a powerful weapon to domestic critics and international skeptics. It raised uncomfortable questions about whether the administration had ignored its own experts in a rush to war, or if the intelligence had been intentionally suppressed to maintain public support for a failing strategy. As the Director of National Intelligence faced accusations of failing to secure classified data, the leaked assessment became the definitive evidence for those arguing that the 2026 Iran War was repeating the errors of the early twenty-first century, chasing an elusive political victory through purely military means.

## **8. The Politics of Blame: Presidential Strategy and Cabinet Accountability**

As the tactical costs and economic fallout of the Iranian conflict began to mount in early March 2026, the executive branch initiated a sophisticated shift in its public communications strategy, transitioning from a narrative of collective triumph to one of individual accountability and

strategic distancing. This maneuver is centered on the presidential ability to frame the ongoing war as an inherited necessity managed by subordinates, rather than a personal crusade. By utilizing the rhetorical shield of being a leader who acts on the information provided to him, the President has begun to insulate his political standing from the volatility of the Middle Eastern theater. This strategy relies heavily on the public interrogation of cabinet members and intelligence officials, effectively preparing a list of scapegoats should the intervention fail to produce a clean and inexpensive victory.

A primary component of this blame strategy involves the characterization of the military leadership and the Secretary of War as being overly aggressive. If the public becomes fatigued by the sight of prolonged strikes or the reality of rising gasoline prices, the administration's rhetoric suggests that the President was presented with a "binary choice" by the Pentagon, where the only alternative to action was national catastrophe. By casting Secretary Pete Hegseth as the champion of a maximalist military posture, the President retains the ability to pivot toward a "peace-maker" role at any moment, claiming he is "reining in the hawks" who overstepped his original, more limited objectives. This creates a political environment where the President can take credit for every successful strike while blaming his advisors for every civilian casualty or diplomatic setback.

Furthermore, the Director of National Intelligence has been positioned as the ultimate fail-safe for the administration's credibility. Through the repeated use of phrases like "I was told," the President has signaled that his decisions are only as good as the intelligence provided by Tulsi Gabbard and her agencies. Should the justification for the initial strikes—specifically the "imminent threat" narrative—be proven insufficient by international investigators, the blame will almost certainly be directed at the intelligence community for failing to provide "perfect data." This strategy of "externalizing failure" allows the executive to maintain his image as a decisive leader while portraying the bureaucracy as a fractured and occasionally incompetent entity that he must constantly supervise and correct.

## **9. Humanitarian Consequences and Regional Spillover: Lebanon and the UAE**

The kinetic intensity of Operation Epic Fury has not remained confined to the geographical borders of the Islamic Republic, as the second week of March 2026 has witnessed a rapid and destabilizing expansion of the conflict into neighboring sovereign states. Lebanon has become the primary secondary theater of the war, with the Israel Defense Forces initiating a multi-divisional ground and aerial campaign designed to neutralize the long-range missile capabilities of Hizballah. As the group declared a state of open war in solidarity with the new leadership in Tehran, the resulting exchange of fire has led to a catastrophic humanitarian situation in

southern Lebanon and the Bekaa Valley. International aid organizations have reported that the displacement of civilians has reached levels not seen since the mid-2000s, while the destruction of dual-use infrastructure has crippled the already fragile Lebanese economy. The administration in Washington has framed these developments as a necessary expansion of the mission to ensure the total degradation of the Iranian proxy network, yet the mounting civilian death toll has begun to erode the diplomatic support of European and Arab partners.

Simultaneously, the conflict has reached the shores of the United Arab Emirates, marking a significant escalation in the targeting of global energy infrastructure. The drone and missile strikes on the Ruwais Industrial City represent a sophisticated attempt by pro-Iranian elements to demonstrate that no regional actor is immune to the consequences of the war. By hitting one of the most critical refining and export hubs in the world, the attackers have succeeded in forcing a partial shutdown of UAE energy production, further tightening the global oil market. This spillover has placed the Emirati leadership in a precarious position, caught between their strategic partnership with the United States and the immediate physical threat posed by Iranian-aligned militias. The strike on Ruwais serves as a grim validation of the warnings issued by the intelligence community regarding the "porous" nature of regional defenses when faced with a coordinated swarm-attack strategy.

The regional spillover has also manifested in the disruption of humanitarian corridors and the suspension of international flight paths over the Persian Gulf. As debris from intercepted missiles falls over populated areas in northern Saudi Arabia and Kuwait, the psychological impact on the regional population has been profound. The "containment" strategy initially promised by the coalition has been replaced by a reality of unpredictability, where the distinction between combatant and non-combatant zones has become increasingly blurred. This expansion suggests that the 2026 Iran War is no longer a localized strike on nuclear facilities but a comprehensive regional realignment achieved through high-intensity violence. The humanitarian consequences, ranging from medical shortages in Beirut to the threat of environmental disaster in the Gulf, are now central to the international debate over the sustainability of the current military course.

## **10. The Whistleblower Prospect: Speculation on Tulsi Gabbard's Resignation**

By the second week of March 2026, the political future of Director of National Intelligence Tulsi Gabbard has become the subject of intense scrutiny within the nation's capital. The speculation surrounding her potential resignation is rooted in the irreconcilable tension between her well-documented history as a critic of regime-change wars and her current role as the overseer of the intelligence apparatus fueling Operation Epic Fury. While Gabbard was initially brought into

the cabinet to represent a populist, non-interventionist check on the "deep state," the reality of a massive kinetic engagement with Iran has placed her in an untenable position. The recent leak of the National Intelligence Council assessment—which directly challenged the administration's claims of an "imminent threat" and the feasibility of a quick victory—is widely viewed as a signal of her internal dissent. Observers suggest that if the President continues to publicly shift the burden of potential failure onto the intelligence community, Gabbard may choose to exit the administration to preserve her political brand as a truth-teller.

The prospect of a Gabbard resignation carries significant risks for the executive branch, as it would likely be accompanied by a "whistleblower" narrative. Given her authority as Director of National Intelligence, a departure predicated on the "politicization of intelligence" would provide her with the standing to declassify or reveal the raw data that reportedly contradicts the administration's war justifications. Such a move would transform her from a loyal cabinet member into a powerful adversary, capable of testifying before Congress or the public about the internal deliberations that led to the February 28 strikes. This "whistleblower prospect" serves as a lingering threat to the administration's control over the war narrative, as it could expose a gap between the intelligence presented to the President and the rhetoric used to sell the conflict to the American people.

Furthermore, the timing of such a move is critical as the 2028 election cycle begins to loom in the distance. For Gabbard, a strategic resignation could allow her to reclaim her identity as a "peace candidate" just as the domestic fallout from \$100-per-barrel oil and regional instability begins to peak. Within the White House, however, the threat of her departure has led to a defensive posture, with some advisors labeling her a "liability" or a "holdover of old thinking." Whether she remains in her post to attempt to influence policy from within or resigns to "reveal the truth" from without, the speculation alone has highlighted the fragile nature of the coalition that brought the current administration to power. The outcome of this standoff will likely determine not only the fate of the DNI but the ultimate transparency of the 2026 Iranian conflict.

## **11. Future Implications: American Populism and Global Stability**

The trajectory of the 2026 Iranian conflict suggests a fundamental transformation in how American populist movements interact with global security architectures. For decades, the populist critique of United States foreign policy was centered on the rejection of "forever wars" and the perceived arrogance of nation-building. However, the execution of Operation Epic Fury demonstrates that a "post-interventionist" stance does not necessarily equate to a policy of restraint. Instead, it has birthed a doctrine of high-intensity, technologically driven kinetic

actions designed to achieve immediate tactical results without the long-term commitment of ground forces. This shift carries significant implications for global stability, as it signals to both allies and adversaries that the United States may be more willing to utilize overwhelming force if it can be framed as a decisive, "America First" protective measure rather than a prolonged diplomatic engagement.

Furthermore, the domestic handling of the war—specifically the use of cabinet officials as political buffers—indicates a new era of executive accountability. By successfully externalizing the blame for economic shocks, such as the spike in oil prices, the administration is attempting to decouple the military actions of the state from the electoral fortunes of the populist leader. If this strategy proves successful, it may provide a blueprint for future leaders to engage in high-stakes international brinkmanship while maintaining a domestic mandate based on anti-establishment rhetoric. The risk, however, remains that the erosion of trust between the executive and the intelligence community, exemplified by the friction with the Director of National Intelligence, could lead to a permanent degradation of the factual basis upon which foreign policy is conducted.

Ultimately, the 2026 conflict serves as a crucible for the "new" American role in the world. As the international community watches the outcome of the struggle for the Strait of Hormuz and the internal stability of the Iranian state, the broader question remains whether a populist-led superpower can provide the predictable leadership required for global economic and maritime security. The reliance on individual loyalty over institutional expertise suggests a more volatile and personality-driven international order. Whether this leads to a swifter resolution of long-standing regional threats or a series of unmanageable escalations will likely define the geopolitical landscape of the late 2020s and determine the viability of populist foreign policy on the world stage.

## **12. Conclusion and References**

The escalation of hostilities between the United States and Iran in early 2026 serves as a definitive case study in the evolution of modern populist foreign policy. Operation Epic Fury, while initially framed as a decisive and limited strike against nuclear and military infrastructure, has rapidly mutated into a complex regional confrontation that tests the structural integrity of the American executive branch. The "Post-Interventionist Paradox" identified in this study highlights the friction between a campaign promise of ending "forever wars" and the tactical reality of maintaining global deterrence. As oil prices remain volatile and the Strait of Hormuz remains a contested chokepoint, the administration's strategy of internalizing credit while externalizing blame—specifically toward figures like Secretary of War Pete Hegseth and Director

of National Intelligence Tulsi Gabbard—suggests a new model of political survival in the face of military uncertainty.

Ultimately, the potential for high-level resignations or whistleblowing from within the intelligence community represents the greatest threat to the current administration's narrative. If the justifications for the 2026 conflict are proven to be politically manufactured rather than intelligence-driven, the long-term credibility of U.S. foreign policy will face a crisis of legitimacy. The outcome of this struggle will not only determine the future of the Middle East and the leadership of the Islamic Republic under Mojtaba Khamenei but will also decide whether the populist approach to global security can coexist with the institutional requirements of international stability. The following references provide the empirical basis for this analysis of the 2026 Iranian Conflict.

## References

Associated Press. (2026, March 9). National Intelligence Council Leaked Assessment: Resilience of the Iranian State Post-Khamenei.

Bloomberg Energy. (2026, March 10). Global Oil Benchmarks: Brent Crude Surpasses 100 Dollars Following Ruwais Attack.

Department of War. (2026, March 1). Operational Briefing: Phase II Objectives of Operation Epic Fury.

Gabbard, T. (2025, December). Keynote Address at Turning Point USA AmericaFest: The New Sovereignty.

Hegseth, P. (2026, March 10). Press Briefing on Regional Strike Intensity and Naval Posture in the Persian Gulf.

International Maritime Organization. (2026, March 5). Shipping Status Report: De Facto Closure of the Strait of Hormuz.

The New York Times. (2026, March 8). Internal Friction: The White House Struggle Between Intelligence and Action.

Office of the Director of National Intelligence. (2026, February 11). Memo on the Dissolution of the Director's Initiative Group.

Reuters. (2026, March 9). UAE Industrial Damage Assessment: Impact of Drone Strikes on Ruwais Refineries.

Truth Social. (2026, March 10). Presidential Statements on Operation Completion and Heritage of the Iran Conflict.

United Nations Security Council. (2026, March 7). Humanitarian Crisis Report: Displacement and Infrastructure Damage in Southern Lebanon.

Wall Street Journal. (2026, March 4). The Rise of Mojtaba: Continuity and Change in the Iranian Supreme Leadership.

The author has published over 5,000 AI-assisted papers at:

<https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Douglas-Youvan/research> . Google Scholar has indexed these preprints, and if you want a particular reference, the AI mode of a Google search (Gemini) has efficiently catalogued these preprints.

